CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

o. 4. JULY, 1917. Vol. VII.

LIFE AND LIBERTY FOR THE CHURCH.

movement demanding "Life and Liberty for the Church Engländ" is being organised by the Revs. William Temple, R. L. Sheppard, J. B. Seaton, and other earnest and rprising Churchmen. Its object appears to be to awaken eral interest in the recommendations of the Archbishops' ort on Church and State, and to secure legislation in that alf. So far the declarations by the promoters of the ement have been extremely vague. Their object may be med up in the following paragraph taken from their ifesto recently published in the *Times*:—

"If the Church is to have new life, even if it is to maintain the life which it has, it must have liberty. Those who are promoting this movement are convinced that we must win for the Church full power to control its own life, even at the cost, if necessary, of disestablishment, and of whatever consequences that may possibly involve."

Ve have always believed, and the view is not novel, that Church draws her life direct from the Holy Spirit, and the way to obtain that life is not only to seek it earnestly, to use it rightly. It is difficult to realise how the Church's ent relation to the State can affect her spiritual life, and same is also true of her moral and intellectual life. Every gyman in the land can, so far as the Church's relation to State is concerned, enjoy fulness of spiritual, moral, and lectual life, and this is also true in the case of the laity in so far as our imperfect social legislation fails to secure

for them decent conditions of existence. But this legislati
of which we have had a most encouraging amount of l
years, is neither helped nor hindered by the Church's pres
relations to Parliament.

The nation would wish to know clearly what use the Chu
intends to make of this liberty she demands. Is she going
use it to turn the National Church into a clericalist se
The Kikuyu controversy has not been forgotten by the nati
and it has given an unpleasant impression of what an organi
body of fanatics could make of the National Church if t
were given a free hand. Liberty for the Church may m
anything, ranging from episcopal tyranny to hopeless anarc
"License they mean when they cry Liberty," represents
aspect of unchartered freedom; "O Liberty, Liberty, w
evils are wrought in thy name," represents the other asp
When liberty is demanded, thoughtful men wish to kn
precisely the limits of the liberty required, and the exact
to which it is proposed to put it. It is more than doub
whether freedom from Parliamentary control would ena
the Church to secure the reforms many earnest Churchm
desire. It will not secure us liturgical reform or theolog
reform, or the better training of ordinands, or better relati
with the Nonconformist and the masses. There are m
branches of the Anglican communion which have no offi
connection with the State, and they are far from flourish
with fulness of life.

It may be urged that this life and liberty movement
secure the swift passage through Parliament in the near fu
of many measures of Church reform which under the exis
relation of Church and State will be blocked. We take le
to doubt this. Why does the Church not get what she w
from Parliament? The answer is threefold. First, the Chu
does not enjoy the confidence of the nation, and so she
not enjoy the confidence of its great representative assem
Did the Church enjoy that confidence she could secure

thing she willed from Parliament. The nation doubts whether the Church exists to serve the nation or to serve herself. There is unfortunately much in her policy and conduct even since the war began which leads the nation to believe that the Church exists to serve herself, and that she is not primarily the loyal and loving servant of the nation. "The Church for the Church's sake" is too often the motive of her policy, although she does not seem to suspect it.

Secondly, the Church in regard to many important reforms is so divided that no common policy can be agreed on by Churchmen. It will take more education, more enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, before anything like unanimity can be secured even in regard to many needful reforms. The Church has been engaged for nearly ten years on liturgical reform. The State has encouraged her by the issue of Royal Letters of Business, yet the Church has not accomplished the reform desired, and what has so far taken place is only too suggestive of *Montes parturientes nascitur ridiculus mus.*

The third reason is that there are some things which the ecclesiastical mind regards as reforms which the lay mind cannot be got to view in that way. The Church Lads' Brigade in the House of Commons may reflect the ecclesiastical mind, but the great majority of the House are in little sympathy with their ideals, and we dare to think that the judgment of Parliament is not to be despised in these matters. After all, Parliament with few exceptions consists of Christians; its proceedings are opened with prayer for the Divine guidance; whilst it is in session prayer is offered throughout the length and breadth of the land that its legislation may be for the good of the Church as well as for the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and his dominions. Christians who believe in the Christian character of the nation on the one hand, and in the power of prayer on the other, will not necessarily regard the judgment of Parliament in ecclesiastical matters as less worthy of respect than that of Convocation. This is a hard saying,

but the record of Parliament even in the matter of Church Reform stands higher than that of Convocation.

Moreover, it is not more legislation that the Church needs, but better administration, not "bloodless administration," but the administration of men full of wisdom and the Holy Ghost.

> "For forms of government let fools contest,
> Whate'er is best administered is best."

Great numbers of administrative reforms can be accomplished without any legislation whatsoever, and are much better accomplished in that way. But in the matter of administration it is the personal equation which counts supremely. Even a bad system worked by wise and good men produces infinitely better results than a perfect system worked by incompetents. There is nothing the Church could not do with her present system if she had the right kind of persons to do it. The solemn nonsense talked at times about the Church's lack of freedom is really an attempt to cast on to somebody else's shoulders the blame for clerical folly and failure.

We believe therefore that efforts to free the Church from Parliamentary control are at the present time a misuse of forces which might be much better employed. The freedom and power enjoyed by the English clergy is enormous; what they need to do is to learn how to use it effectively. It is true that the parochial laity have much less power than they ought to have in parochial matters, but the passing of a measure constituting Parochial Councils with legal powers in every parish will meet that difficulty. We have no desire to see Mr. Temple's well-meant efforts end in Disestablishment, Disendowment, and Disruption, but we fear that this may be the result unless the whole matter is handled very carefully. We desire Church Reform as ardently as any body of Churchmen, but there are reforms and reforms, and the reforms which will give the Church of England a new heart and a new spirit are the reforms most to be striven after, and no alteration of the Church's relation to Parliament is going to give her those.

THE CHURCH'S FAILURE.*

By the Master of Balliol.

"The Church's Failure"—it is not a pleasant title, nor perhaps a just one; but I have lately been asked by two bishops to hold a committee meeting to discuss the Church's failure in relation to the social problem now as compared with its attitude in the Middle Ages. I consulted some eminent historical authorities and others on the question; one said, "Has not the Church always conformed to the age?" another said, "It has always been a case of the outside of the cup and platter, and more so now than then;" others have said that it came in with the Reformation, or the Industrial Revolution. Then I tried a soldier, and he said, "Our chaplain preaches about food economy, but always takes two 'helpings' himself." A candidate in an examination wrote that "England was converted to Christianity by Augustine, but then there came a wave of Paganism which has remained, more or less, ever since."

The Memorandum† presented to you to-day would attribute it largely to the lack of proper training of candidates for Orders. Our experience at Oxford enables us to say that this is not from any want of interest in the social problems of the time, for they have never been studied more eagerly and more seriously than in the last few years. It certainly is not due to the old aggressive Agnosticism which was so marked in the sixties and seventies, for this is quite dead and gone; as I realised when I asked an old contemporary how many men he supposed would come to the Bishop of Oxford's addresses, given every night for a week, on the subject of "The practical duties of men who call themselves Christians," he said,

* An Address delivered at the London Public Meeting of the Churchmen's Union on June 21st, 1917.

† *The Training of the Clergy*, a Memorandum presented to the Churchmen's Union by the Very Rev. Hastings Rashdall, Rev. Canon Glazebrook, and Rev. H. D. A. Major. Published by John Murray, price 6d.

"I suppose Gore is quite an influential person now" (Bishop Gore was also a contemporary in the same college); I told him this might be said without undue exaggeration. He guessed there might be 50 at the first meeting and 20 at the others; when I told him the numbers were 1,400 and 800, he said, "Well, things must be pretty different from our time." But what we *do* find is that a very small proportion of men take Orders, and some of the men of most ability and character distinctly avoid this vocation to which they seem to be naturally called. It seems partly due to a feeling that they get more real work in these social and practical questions by adopting other careers. They also tend to look askance at the type of "budding parson" which they see being produced in theological colleges. Of this feeling I remember a rather ludicrous example: two friends were talking about the Church some 30 years ago, both Fellows of an Oxford College. One said, "Well, the man who takes Orders to-day must surely be either a fool or a knave, or both!" the second, now an extremely eminent ecclesiastic, said, "I think on this point I ought to tell you that I have to-day announced that I am going to take Orders;" the first replied, "On this point it seems better to change the conversation!"

In the Memorandum it is urged that there is a lack of proper training, even of the men who *do* go to these theological colleges. As to this charge the Memorandum constitutes an impressive indictment which, so far as I can judge, is borne out; but I do not offer an opinion of my own, and would only make some remarks from outside:—

(1) The indictment is made more weighty because we are at a point where the training of ordinary elementary school teachers, up to university tutors, is certainly going to take a fresh start under the impulse of the "Education Crusade," the first-fruit of which has been the appointment of Mr. Fisher, a case of appointing a man in politics simply because he was the man best fitted for the job, and a case which,

therefore, has struck dismay into the politicians, and has caused a general agreement that it must not be taken as a precedent.

(2) There are signs also that the level of work and of results in our Universities will be distinctly raised by the tremendous impression of this war, and even by the severe conditions which will follow it. Already the proportion of men at Oxford who take Honours is more than half of the whole number—and that is a much greater number—whereas forty years ago it was hardly a quarter; or more than 500 take Honours yearly, instead of about 150.

(3) Then, again, we are told by great financial authorities that for a long time to come the cost of living will remain about double the pre-war cost. This constitutes a serious problem for all higher education, for the first thing on which it occurs to the Englishman to economise is education. I cannot see how this is to be met without a great extension of funds for the assistance of those who lack means, but who do not lack fitness for University education. Such a fund has already been started for Eton. Will not similar funds be needed to assist candidates for Orders? And, if so, whence is the fund to come except from the contributions of churchpeople, in which I include laymen far more than clergy, for I am convinced that this throwing of the financial responsibility on laymen is a key to the whole problem of Church Reform—though it may be well to warn the clergy that laymen must have more powers granted them in return, particularly in parochial matters.

(4) Another remedy for the great lack of candidates must surely be found by enlarging downwards the recruiting area. Whom do the men in the trenches regard as the most successful "Padres?"—as they call them. One, I have been told, a Roman Catholic priest, uses the same language as the men,—you know what I mean—utterly uncon-

ventional; he has often risked his life for them, a
for him they would do anything.

This recruiting from a more democratic stratum m
mean for a time at anyrate, less Latin and Greek,—but wh
of that? I have seen enough of these subjects to be well aw
that the ridiculous modicum demanded for a "degree" is alm
negligible as a means of education or for the formation
character.

There are certain points in the memorandum that I am al
to confirm from ten years' experience of working-class studen
These points are:—

(1) The need for training in the simple statement
doctrines. The working-man is quite clear-head
and fully able to grasp abstract ideas, but wh
baffles him is unusual terminology, which he is a
to regard as jargon.

(2) Training in simple and direct Apologetics, as it
called, *i.e.*, the answer to the question "Why shou
I be a Christian?"—and meeting the very shall
but very current objections and difficulties; yet n
always shallow, *e.g.*, a working-class student in c
Summer School got up and said, "I know I sh
have all my difficulties solved here; that is why
came to Oxford. I want to ask you this,—as G
must be good, why does he allow evil?" If anyo
here has an equally short answer to this sh
question, he will find it often very useful.

(3) Training in the elements of the social problems whi
as we already see, will be rising to appalli
magnitude after the war. For already we he
"Will there be Civil War after the War?"—t
mere putting of such a question ought to
impossible in, I won't say a Christian communi
but in a community of rational citizens.

Here I would like to add to the Memorandu
that it is absolutely necessary to train men to
able to regard the economic and industrial co
ditions from both sides of the question,—a v

difficult requirement; but the lack of it was the real cause of the recent great strike, and is quite likely to produce another, and a worse one.

(4) Training in preaching and in reading considered as "arts." Even so simple a thing as voice production, is a matter on which we are probably worse in England than in any other country.

(5) Training in the topics and methods required in Sunday Schools, to meet the C.L.C. Schools which are working so vigorously on definite anti-Social and anti-Christian lines. It is no use to ignore these; they must be faced and met boldly.

(6) Training to lay stress on the points which unite men, rather than the points on which they differ. It is astonishing—though I do not know why it should be astonishing—how little the mass of men care for the ordinary party shibboleths of the Church, *e.g.*, how little "the religious difficulty," which is supposed to lie at the threshold of education, presents itself as a difficulty to the average parent. The mass of men, it might be objected, are not religious; well, I might quote a verdict by a well-known High Church chaplain:—

> "They seem utter pagans, wrapped up in material and sensuous things; *but* when you see that they will give their lives without hesitation to save a comrade, they bear the most awful wounds with stoical heroism, they die in a childlike faith in the ultimate goodness of things, you feel that they are not so far from religion after all."

Even the Universities, by their use of the phrase "graduated in the trenches," recognise that there are other ways than books for developing character and even stimulating intellect; and I think that we shall find that, after the war, "graduated in the trenches" is not altogether a bad thing when millions who have done so come back. The opportunity is greater than has ever been since the rise of the Wesleyan movement in the 18th century, or even since the rise of Puritanism in the 17th century; will the Church prove equal to the opportunity? The answer depends on the clergy first of all.

REPRISALS.

The war has kept on raising the most serious practical problems for the Christian Church. The most serious at the present time is the rightness or wrongness of reprisals. Most of our Christian teachers have condemned reprisals; but a small minority have dared to justify them.

We ought at the outset to recognise that it requires less moral courage in a bishop to condemn reprisals than to support them, for, as Hugh Benson pointed out, it requires more courage for a bishop to refuse to say his prayers in the company of his fellow bishops than for a school-boy to say his prayers in his dormitory amid jeering school-fellows.

Reprisals seem essentially un-Christian. The thought of them shocks the Christian consciousness. Shall we fall to the level of the German barbarians? Shall we outrage all the rules of civilized warfare and kill women and children? We declare that the Psalmist offends against Christian feeling when he sings:—

> "Blessed shall he be that serveth thee as thou hast served us. Yea, blessed shall he be that taketh thy little ones and dasheth them against the stones."

Dare we then advocate what he commends? The analogy is a false one. The Psalmist is impelled by motives of revenge. It is plain that to undertake reprisals for purposes of revenge is utterly un-Christian, but to undertake reprisals for the purpose of protecting English women and children does not stand on the same footing. The duty of our military and naval authorities is to protect our women and children. If they are clearly of opinion that this can best be done by bombing German towns, then it is their duty to do it. If they can protect our women and children effectively by means less terrible, it is plain that they ought to choose that means. We feel, when we remember the humane and chivalrous manner in which they have striven to conduct this war, that this matter can be safely left in their hands.

"An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" is condemned by Christ as a motive for action. To wish to knock out another

man's eye because he has knocked out one's own eye, however natural, is highly un-Christian, but to blind a man to prevent him from blinding others is not un-Christian at all. Is it not loing what is best for the man himself as well as what is best for his neighbours? Justice and love ought to be our motives n our conduct towards our fellows. We need both motives as our guide; Justice, giving every man what is due to him; Love, giving every man what is best for him. Each has to be kept n line if our course is to be straight, otherwise it will wobble between hardness and sentimentality. The two ideals must not be separated, for they are really one. To give a man what s due to him is to give him what is best for him, and *vice versa*. According to our character, God in the experience of our life comes to us either in the form of justice or of love.

That great-hearted Englishman, Charles Kingsley, in the *Water Babies* in his allegory of Mrs. Be-done-by-as-you-did and Mrs. Do-as-you-would-be-done-by brings this out clearly. In the last chapter the severe and terrible Mrs. Be-done-by-as-you-did and the kind and beautiful Mrs. Do-as-you-would-be-done-by turn out to be the same person. To the foolish, cruel and immoral she always came in the form of Mrs. Be-done-by-as-you-did, but to the good, honourable and loving she came in the form of Mrs. Do-as-you-would-be-done-by.

Wisdom, justice, love permit us to undertake reprisals, if they can be undertaken effectively. Germany has committed a series of most wanton and cruel crimes: sins against civilisation and humanity. In times of peace she assented most treacherously, as it would now seem, to principles of humane warfare, and she has falsely departed from them in war time under the mistaken notion that she is thereby furthering her own interests. If reprisals will effectively check her treachery, and bring her to see both the barbarity and folly of her action, it is a duty to use them. At least half of our civilisation is the product of lessons learnt in suffering, and that suffering has been inflicted in no spirit of revenge, but as a means of moral discipline and education.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CREEDS.

The problem of the Creeds is producing a divergence of policy among Liberal Churchmen. Some, with Professor Sanday, desire simply to claim freedom of interpretation, or the right to re-interpret the Creeds in accordance with the results of scriptural criticism and modern knowledge. Others, although glad of the right of *creedal re-interpretation*, feel that there is also serious need for *creedal re-statement*. They are aware that the three Creeds in our Prayer Book are a selection and a very excellent selection, from nearly three hundred Creeds of the ancient Church, as can be seen by consulting Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, but they see no reason why the ancient Church should have the right to frame Creeds, and why this right should be denied to the modern Church. In this age the Christian consciousness, moulded by contemporary science and philosophy, has its way of viewing Christian faith and duty, and it is a common-place to say that it differs from the way of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. Therefore the Christian consciousness of this age ought to be free to express itself in a modern Christian Creed, which it should be optional to recite at public worship.

To frame such a Creed is not easy. Obviously it must be very simple, and must be limited to Christian essentials. Moreover, the language employed must not only be true to our way of thinking, believing and feeling, it must also be associated by long usage with the profoundest convictions of Christian faith and devotion. A modern Creed, which used such modern terminology as theistic, ethical, immanent, vital, evolutionary, would seem intolerable.

The best solution, we believe, is to be found by going back to the most hallowed of English literature, namely, the New Testament, in the Authorised Version, and in striving, by a

udicious selection from this sacred treasury, to construct a Creed. The New Testament is at once the oldest and the newest of Christian books. Thus it is possible to construct Creeds from it which, while voicing modern convictions, yet do so in such a way as to mark their continuity with the Christian faith of what was theologically the golden age of the Church.

The following Creed, drawn entirely from the Johannine writings, we venture to offer as an example of what we mean. Although older than the Apostles' Creed and much older than the Nicene Creed, it is really much more modern than either in its way of presenting the Christian faith:—

> We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.
>
> We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in the light as He is in the light we have fellowship one with another.
>
> We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.
>
> We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.
>
> We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.
>
> We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.
>
> We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. *Amen.*

This Creed is not an affirmation of bare theological and historical facts, but an expression of Christian faith, duty, and experience. It presents the Christian faith and the Christian life together. It sets forth present realities not past events, and it is this way of presenting our religion which brings it home to men's business and bosoms. Moreover, it has the advantage of having been composed by one who was pre-eminently the Theologian of the Apostolic Church; one who saw and presented our religion *sub specie aeternitatis* and strove to liberate it from a crude Jewish Messiahism on the one hand, and from a vague, speculative, Oriental theosophy on the other.

MAGIC AND RELIGION.

By Principal F. B. Jevons, D.Litt.

Calamity, actual or imminent, is a departure from the ordinary course of things, and provokes a departure from the ordinary course of belief, thought, and action. The departure may take, as it frequently has taken, the direction of a sudden reversion to some discarded mode of action or of belief. The religious belief, which had lost its hold of a man, may suddenly regain it: thus, the Persians on their retreat from Athens were met with calamity in the freezing of the Strymon, and as Aeschylus, with the insight of the poet, interpreting their feelings, says in the *Persae*, many a one, who recked nought of the gods before, then prayed:—

θεοὺς δέ τις
τὸ πρὶν νομίζων οὐδαμοῦ τότ' ηὔχετο.

And human nature in that respect is, as reports from the front testify, the same now when the Germans are drawing slowly back from France, as it was when the Persians were driven back from Athens.

But though, under the pressure of danger, the reversion may take the form of a return to religion, on the part of those who had more or less abandoned it, on the part of those who have not abandoned religion, the reversion may and does take another direction. When the gods of a community have been supplicated, and, as increasing calamity shows, have been supplicated in vain, then recourse may be had to magic: such was the case in ancient Rome, as the pages of Livy proclaim. And Saul visited the witch of Endor. A time of calamity may be a time for the recrudescence of magic. In this time of war clairvoyants make their appearance often, both in the police courts and elsewhere. At no time, even in any Christian country, has the belief in magic and witchcraft entirely disappeared: it is always latent and ready to re-appear. The most we can say is

that the belief, though it does not utterly vanish, is waning on the whole. The reason why it is in times of calamity that the recrudescence of magic takes place is that it was on such occasions that belief in magic originally arose. The belief in magic goes back to the period in human evolution, known as the "animistic" period, when the only explanation of any happening that called for explanation was that it must have been done by somebody. When sickness or death happened, it was self-evident that someone had brought it about: the only question was, Who did it? The question proceeds upon the tacit assumption that the sickness and consequent death are the doing of some man or woman; and on that assumption the whole superstructure of magic is based. The question was a practical question, put by the relatives of the dead or dying man, because they wished either to avert or to avenge the death. And, as the question was based upon an erroneous assumption, the attempt to answer it necessarily led to further errors, which it is necessary to note because they supplied much of the material of the superstructure built upon the tacit and erroneous assumption that what had happened must have been done by somebody. First, we may note that, as no one had in fact brought about the demise of the deceased, no one had been seen in the act of doing it: the worker of this evil was conceived therefore to have done this evil work in secret, and from a distance. Next, it was obvious that, since he had done this mischief, he must have had the power to work evil—a mysterious power. Thus, the original false assumption, that the sickness or death had been brought about by somebody, led to the further false conclusion that the man who had brought it about was a man of mysterious power who worked evil in secret and from a distance—and that is precisely what is everywhere meant by a magician or warlock or witch. Armed with this purely *a priori* conception of the worker of evil, the relatives of the dead or dying man were equipped with the means to answer the question, the very practical question,

Who did it? They had but to look for a man or woman whose appearance was such as to mark him out from ordinary people as mysterious, forbidding, and dangerous; and anyone, whose looks and mode of behaviour were, in the consensus of general opinion, habitually strange and incomprehensible, would thereby be marked out as obviously the man who had done this strange and incomprehensible evil.

The person thus singled out had, of course, not caused the death or sickness, and knew that he had not. But the relations of the dead or dying man knew better; they would accept none of his denials. They approached him with caution, with fear indeed—for what he had done once, he had power to do again—and they regarded his denials as perfectly natural, and as confirmations conclusive of their suspicion. They approached him because they wished to induce him by presents to put a stop to the sickness he had caused; if he denied that it was his doing, the reason for his denial was obvious—the offers they had made him were not high enough. Thus he found himself credited in general opinion with a mysterious power, which he was not himself conscious of exercising, or even of possessing. It is not unpleasing to discover that one has—latent—powers one had no suspicion of, until other people discovered them. It is therefore no wonder if the man credited with mysterious power comes to believe that he has the power with which he is credited—a power which is as mysterious to him as it is to those who unfeignedly believe that he has it. Even if he retains, as he probably does retain, a suspicion—or perhaps more than a suspicion—that he has no such power, he will still be tempted to try whether he has the power really. The *modus operandi* is found in its simplest form amongst the Australian black-fellows: the man of power has but to withdraw into secrecy and then, at a distance from his victim, to say, in the proper tone and with the appropriate gesture, "may your bones be rent asunder," and, if he has the power, the result which he

our inherent sonship. This vital experience affects the significance of all rites and symbols. For instance, in the ecclesiastical view, the altar represents the offering of gifts by man to God. Vital vision transforms the altar-symbol into the experience of thankful response to the eternal self-giving of God. Vital communion is the circulation of the spirit of life throughout all the members of the human family. The living members are always life-giving because they are always life-receiving. They trust the Lord, the giver of life, whole-heartedly, to bring forth in and through them the righteous fruits of life. The Vine, or indeed any fruit-bearing tree, is the living symbol that best illustrates this point of view. The sap is the lord and giver of life to the whole, expressing itself in flower and leaf, and ultimately in fruit. Fruit is life made serviceable to the needs of wayfarers.

(3) What, then, is the practical outcome of the distinction we have been noting? Seeing that the one life is common to all, human growth is the result of voluntary response to "the power that worketh in us," that brings increasing assurance that it will lift us into the recognition of its own meaning and purpose. The question for us always is, not what shall we do with life, but what is life making of us? Its purpose and meaning become clear just in so far as we are willing and able to be responsive to it, to keep in touch with vital experience. So the Church, which is the association of inspired personalities, is not alive until it lose rigidity and self-consciousness. It must become sensitive to the ever-growing needs of men, and must witness in word and act to the presence of the life-giving Spirit. What, then, is the foe against which we must ever be on our guard? It is surely entirely spiritual. We fight, not against persons or institutions, but against spirits that unlawfully dominate them. The cause of the weakness of the Church to-day is clearly that it is infected with the spirit of worldliness. This spirit always shows itself in low aims and ambitions, in small intrigues and policies. It is always

levelling things down to the narrow range of its own ignorance and short-sight. It would have everything to be uniform and conventional. It lives in a fog, and admires uniformity. The way of the Spirit of life is the reverse. He is always levelling up. He brings all into light, and light into all, so that we may, in His light, judge and understand, and know what we worship.

The basis of Christian fellowship is the possession of a common object of worship. The lack of this to-day is evident enough. We have it in the exalted Christ, Who is God revealed in and through perfected manhood. In Him is expressed not only what we are in God's sight; He is also the pledge, security and power of fulfilment of God's purpose in every one of us; He makes known to us, and perfects in us, that which is enshrined in the original gift of our creation. Herein lies the distinctive message of the Church of Christ as to the object of our worship.

The issue of worship is service. To the "lesser orthodoxy" it may seem that the service of God and the service of men are separable, and that the first is satisfied by the due performance of religious observances. But to vital vision the two are one. "Ye serve the Lord Christ," says St. Paul. Here again there is a levelling up. Can there be a nobler ambition for us than to be the means through whom God may bring every man into the consciousness and fruition of His inherent sonship? The work of God is to gather all the creation into fellowship with Himself. Service well-pleasing to Him is co-operation in this work. Of this the harvest field is the best symbol. We are told in Galatians, v. 22, what is the fruit of the Spirit of life, how that He fashions in us the likeness of the living Christ, and so makes us serviceable for human needs.

He makes us self-giving in the service of others, so that we may quicken in them the secure hope that in themselves too He will bring forth and mature the same fruit.

A MODERNIST'S POINT OF VIEW.*

By the Rev. R. Webb-Odell, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Enfield, Middlesex.

I would have you note, to begin with, my title. It is *not* "A Modernist's Creed," it *is* "A Modernist's Point of View." I should repudiate whole-heartedly the eschatological theory of Our Lord's teaching which George Tyrrell adopted as his own. There is no one Creed, no one Theology, no one Form of Visible Communion common to Modernists—but there is a community of spiritual outlook, a community of *point of view*. The distinction between Religion and Theology is the first point, therefore, of the Modernist's Message. Theology is philosophized Religion, and philosophy changes with the centuries, while Religion abides. Theology is the formulation of Religious Truth to meet the needs of a particular era, and the needs of one generation are not the needs of the next. The Conciliar decisions of the fourth and following centuries supplied apt answers to the speculative questionings of those times. The *Summa* of St. Thomas, fulfilled admirably a like office eight centuries further on, but we live neither in the fourth century nor in the thirteenth, and Darwin, rather than Plato or Aristotle, is for us, "the master of those who know." Hence the claim to interpret the Creeds in the terms of the living science and philosophy of the present day. Hence the hope, entertained by many, that a fresh orientation of Theology may be possible for a century which evinces at least as many tokens of true religion—I think this is an understatement—as any century before, and possible for a Church which still enjoys the promise that it will be guided into all truth by the Holy Spirit of God.

But when we think a re-statement of theology probable, we must remember that a reverent agnosticism is taught us by Modern Science. To St. Athanasius and to St. Thomas, as

* Paper read before the Clerical Society of Enfield and Tottenham.

to the Jews of old, the problem of God was a comparatively simple affair. Personality could be attributed to Him in a manner entirely anthropomorphised and naive. He was indeed "a magnified and non-natural man." Copernicus, Newton, and their followers have changed all that. The most elementary study of the Physical Universe shows us that the Artificer and Upholder of it, in His Pure Godhead, we cannot conceive. The problem used to be to explain Jesus in terms of Godhead. The problem now is to interpret the Godhead in terms of Jesus. This it is which makes the Gospel according to St. John, the most modern book in the world. "No man hath seen God at any time," and yet, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." God has revealed, not all that is to be known, but all that we are capable of knowing, all that it is needful to know. When we compare the Athanasian Symbol to the "guesses of a five-year old child at the contents of his father's library," it is with reverence, not impertinence, for the parable has three implications. It is, thanks to his father, that the child can even guess; it is certain that some day, the child will be taught more; it is certain that what matters to the child, is not the equipment of his father's intellect, but the assurance of his father's love. Again, when we say that Christ has for us "the value of God," that value-judgment (to use the Ritschlian phrase) carries with it no detraction from His Divine Nature, but rather the acknowledgment that all we know of God is contained in the Revelation of Jesus Christ.

"God *may* have other Words for other Worlds:
But for this World, the Word of God is Christ."

"If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." That was Creed enough for St. Paul. Some day it will again be Creed enough for the Church.

Another leading feature of Modernism is the appeal to the experience of the present rather than to the history of the past: an appeal which is utterly misrepresented if regarded as placing ideas in front of facts. The basis of the Modernist movement

indeed is the appeal to the most vital and central class of facts—religious experience in all ages and in all branches of the Christian Church. Here in past and in present alike, is unanimity beyond the discord of brawling Councils and of jarring Creeds: and in the Activism of Eucken many find the philosophy which will restore the supremacy of the Spirit in the affairs of the Church. As to History, so far as it shows us an Unique Figure, beyond and above His first Historians, so far an appeal to it is justified—so far there are facts there—the One Great Fact. But if the appeal is to the literal accuracy of every detail in the evangelic narrative as the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, then the answer must be "thou hast appealed to Caesar: to Caesar shalt thou go." If History is the measure of Faith, then Historic Criticism must decide what that Faith shall be.

Again, in an age of widely diffusing science and culture, the Modernist boldly claims all science and culture for the service of the Church and the Church's Lord. With a terseness of epigram which may be commended to his Anglican imitators, the Bishop of Rome described Modernism as the "synthesis of all heresies." The force of the denunciation was somewhat weakened by the fact that, with the guilelessness of ignorance, he applied to it censures which an equally infallible predecessor had directed originally against St. Thomas Aquinas! But be that as it may, if we believe with Bishop Creighton that the note and justification of Anglicanism is "the appeal to sound learning," there is no doubt what to us must be the "synthesis of all heresies." It is the appeal from the conclusions of sound learning to the ignorance, prejudice and stupid conversatism of the average congregation. The man who counts is the man in the study; and what we learn from him, must be handed on to the man in the pew, and used to convert the man in the street to a more serious consideration of the claims of the Faith.

Lastly, the Modernist differs from the individualistic and disruptive Protestant, by the social and anti-schismatic nature

of his Faith. Valuing almost extravagantly the social and religious effects of Church and Sacraments, he maintains that it is clearly the will of the Spirit of Jesus that through Church and Sacraments His Gospel should be handed on. In a Socialistic Century, the one thing that is barren of hope is a purely individualist Faith. So, too, while realising, and because he realises that each section of the Church of Christ has its own contribution to make to the many-coloured Wisdom of God, schism or the establishment of a new sect is to the Modernist, Treason against the Holy Ghost. Rather, whether frowned on or not by the authority of the moment, let each remain within the Communion wherein he was born, so that the little leaven may leaven the whole lump, and our grandchildren may see perhaps the consummation of that unity in diversity when Love, Mysticism, and the Eucharist will bind together Christian bodies differing doubtless in many non-essential things. Even Rome will some day make its act of Protestantism, and then Protestantism will cease to be. From Liberal Protestantism too, Modernism is wide as the poles asunder. The Holy Ghost has been with the Church. It was under His guidance that St. Paul baptised into Christ the Mystery Concept of Greek Religion, and gave us the Church's Sacramental Doctrine. Under His Guidance, that in an age which otherwise had been anarchic, the august Empire of the mediaeval Papacy fulfilled its high calling from God. Under His Guidance, that the Reformation came with lessons of freedom we have not yet been worthy to master to the full; and under His Guidance and no other, the Church presses forward to the things that are before till all be fulfilled. The history of Christianity has not been a mistake.

Yet the claims of Rome and of all religions of authority, cannot be substantiated. We after all are the Fathers, as Bacon pointed out to the men of his time, 300 years ago. Religion is not static, but dynamic. Though it be true that we are but as the little boy perched on his father's shoulders,

and have no cause for boasting; still we *can* see further than our fathers, and of the new vision we must give account.

Modernism, thank God, is undenominational, in the best sense of that much abused word. Yet I think it is not only my natural predilection for my own Communion which makes me dream that in the Church of England, it will find its most natural and most inspiring home. At a critical moment in the world's religious history, our Church, while retaining all that maintained its unbroken continuity with the past, yet elected in the exegesis of crucial passages of Scripture ("Thou art Peter," "This is my Body," "Hail, Mary, full of grace"), to ignore the practically unanimous interpretation of the Bishops of the Western Church, including her own, and to follow that imposed by the free and non-official scholarship of the day. Having thus rationalised the interpretation of Scripture, she next laid down in the 8th Article of Religion that the ground of our belief in, and reception of the Creeds, is their agreeableness with that Scripture thus opened to the investigation of scholars, and in the 19th and 21st are stated views as to the infallibility of Churches and General Councils which certainly make it impossible for views to be imposed on us as *de fide* on the authority of Churches or of Councils alone. So whoever may be uneasy in his allegiance to the Church of England, the Modernist is not. The Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury stands in 1916 where it did in 1559, on the side of unreasoning officialism. Yet the earth moves, though the Pope has never given it leave. The tide comes irresistibly in, in spite of the episcopal Mrs. Partingtons and their mops.

May I say, in conclusion—what is not a matter of controversy—that there is a real danger of hasty movement, of undue abandonment of positions in matters of the Faith; and also that a very full, and tactful, and affectionate consideration should be, and must be, given to those babes in Christ who are saved, as we all must be—not by theology, whether modernist or preterist—but by their Faith in and Love for the Redeeming

Lord. But can anyone say that this is the present peril, or that it ever can be so in our somewhat overstately, over conventional English Church? Rather, the temptation is to seek peace before truth, to shrink from the discomfort involved in facing facts, whether of science or of criticism, or the hard, cold facts that the majority of all men, the vast majority of thinking men, are drifting away from communion with the visible Church. It is easy to imitate Rome, to reduce ourselves to a "narrow, waspish, pietistic sect, glorying in the rigidity of its own exclusiveness," to make a solitude, and call it peace. It is harder, but more in accordance with God's Will, to bring new things as well as old from our treasures. It must be right to follow Him—the greatest of all traditionalists, for He fulfilled all the Law, and yet the greatest of all Modernists, for He made all things new.

THE REFORM OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.*

In view of the recent appointment of a committee by the Archbishops to "consider and report upon the ways in which the public worship of the Church can be more directly related to the felt needs of actual life at the present time," we venture as a body of Liberal Churchmen, representative in some ways of lay rather than of clerical feeling, and not least of that lay feeling which, while loyal to the Church and its principles, is yet highly dissatisfied with certain features of its Public Worship, to make a statement setting forth what, in our estimation, are the chief causes of dissatisfaction and the proper remedies for them.

In our statements, we wish, as far as possible, to avoid controversial questions, especially in regard to minutiae, and desire to confine ourselves to practical issues. If the Convocations during the last ten years, since the issue of the Royal Letters of Business, have not made that progress in dealing with this matter which some anticipated, it is due not only to the great difficulty of their task but also to the fact that they have become immersed in a multitude of details and ecclesiastical controversies which,

* A Memorandum on Public Worship presented to the Council of the Churchmen's Union at their meeting on June 22nd, 1917.

wills ensues. If the victim should happen to fall ill, the power of the operator is proved. If the *opus* should not prove *operatum*, the failure is easily understood: some other magician has counter-acted the operation; or, at any rate, the magical power is *ex hypothesi* mysterious, and therefore not absolutely or uniformly under control; or, if under control, then it is plain to those who have paid for the operation that they have not paid enough: in civilised countries the palm must be crossed with gold, if crossing it with silver is unsuccessful.

The operator who believes, more or less, in his mysterious power may, in the case of failure, feel that he has not directed it with sufficient accuracy, if he simply turns in the direction of his victim, as he speaks the words. He then "points"—as the native word is translated—with his rod in the right direction. Or, to make still more sure, he draws on the sand a representation of his victim, or models his figure in clay, and pierces it where he wishes his victim to feel the injury. And the blow he deals is the blow his victim feels: there are not two blows, one dealt by him, and the other subsequently felt by his victim. There is but one blow: the blow dealt is the blow felt—that is of the essence of the magic and the mysterious power.

Thus far we have been considering magic as the cause, or rather the magician as the author of calamity; and it is in that character that the magician and the witch have, in all ages, been predominant, viz., as workers of evil and enemies of society. In Africa the witch-finder "smells out the witch." In the Old Testament the injunction is laid down, "thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." In ancient Athens and in the Roman empire the law ran to the same effect. Throughout mediaeval Europe witches, to the number of many thousands, were burnt. But the belief in witchcraft, and in the power of some human beings to upset the course of nature, has another side, which, though less obviously, has none the less certainly impeded the progress of civilisation and religion.

The man who is supposed to have the power of causing, an therefore of ceasing to cause, sickness and other calamities easily supposed to have the power of producing health an other benefits: the superhuman power, erroneously ascribed t certain persons, may be used for ends which society approve of, as well as for ends of which it disapproves. The same ma may indeed use the superhuman power, which he is falsel supposed to possess, now for bad ends and now for good. Bu there is a tendency on the part of society to discriminate th two uses, and on the part of the man of power to specialise i the one direction or the other. If he specialises in the directio of which society disapproves, he is at all times liable to b "smelled out" and put to death as an enemy of society. Bu if he specialises in the other direction, he becomes honoure and respected: he acts for the good of society, and collaborate for the benefit of the community with the gods of th community. Thus the man of power, who originally is credite with the power to cause sickness or death, or to prevent it becomes in the course of time, if he devotes himself to end which society disapproves of, a wizard or magician; or, if h dedicates himself to ends which are considered to be for th good of society, he comes to be accounted a holy man. Then the popular tendency is to believe conversely, if a man is holy and dear to the gods, he must of necessity have the power t do marvels: he can make axe-heads float; he can make, o invoke, rain; his rod, if it turns into a serpent, will swallow up the serpents into which magicians have turned their rods. In the eyes of the vulgar, the difference between the holy-man and the magician is that the power exercised by the former is more powerful than that exercised by the latter—and that is why the belief in magic has been more baleful in religion even than in other departments of civilisation. For signs and wonders the vulgar look, and with them are apt to be contented.

If, however, we go on to infer that from these premisses it follows that there is no difference between magic and religion,

we shall be making exactly the same mistake as if we were to infer that there is no difference between magic and medicine, because magic and medicine were originally closely intertwined, and the physician is still apt to be regarded as having some of the mysterious power which the savage imputes to the "medicine-man."

Closely intertwined though magic and medicine were at the beginning, and for long afterwards, they are absolutely different now, and they never were at any time the same thing. So too with religion and magic: there is, as Sir James Frazer rightly says, "a fundamental distinction and opposition of principle between magic and medicine"; and the action of magic on religion has been much more insidious and deleterious than the action of magic on medicine. In Babylonia and ancient Egypt religion never escaped from the close and fatal embrace of magic. In Egypt the consuming desire of the individual was to procure himself a happy life in the next world, and it was by magic he sought to procure it. In Babylonia man was tormented with the fear of those who wrought evil by means of magic; and it was by means of counter-magic that religion sought to defeat the magician; and the result was that the chief god came to be regarded as the arch-magician. In Brahminism sacrifice, the chief religious rite, has become a piece of magic whereby the priest controls the gods. From any such calamitous result the Western world has been delivered because both the Hebraic spirit and the Hellenic spirit revolted against magic and witchcraft. Both Jew and Greek treated the sin of witchcraft indeed as an offence punishable with death, but unfortunately both committed the mistake—inevitable indeed, but none the less harmful in its results—of assuming magic to be a fact, and of failing to see that the belief in magic is based upon a false assumption. So long as the power of the magician or witch is believed in, so long the belief in magic flourishes; and so long as the law of the land punishes witchcraft, so long witchcraft and magic are, as it were, state-established. In

England now it is no longer the imaginary power that is punishable at law; and the pretence to such power, if it is used as a means of gaining money, is punished merely as an attempt to gain money by false pretences. The belief in such power is, rightly, not an offence against the law: it must die out, if it ever is to die out, because of the spread of education and of the influence of higher religious ideas. And it is dying out, though it is yet far from dead, as its recrudescence in the present time of calamity shows. The results of science are ascribed no longer to the power of the man of science, but to the operations of the laws of nature. The physician or surgeon knows—though not all his patients understand—that it is by obeying nature he commands her, and not by means of any magical power proceeding from himself. But though magic in the sphere of science is dead, and in that of medicine nearly dead, in the sphere of religion things are different even in Christian countries. Saints and their relics are believed by many people to work wonders which, if produced otherwise, would be pronounced to be sheer magic; and which, by those who do not believe in magic, are regarded as not having happened, or as due to natural and not to miraculous causes. By other people, again, mediums are supposed to possess power which is personal to them and magical in its effects; but, as it is by no means uniform or certain in its operation, the power of the medium is explained to be not absolutely or uniformly under the control of the medium.

The belief in magic is essentially the belief that the magician has a power to control by his will the course of events. What that power is supposed, by those who believe in it, to be may be illustrated by an analogy. When a ball on the billiard-table has been set rolling by the cue, its course is determined simply and solely by the laws of nature. If that course is not quite what the player wished, he may, by involuntary gestures, or even by spoken words, show his desire to control by his will the direction of the ball. The player

probably does not imagine that he can by his will control or determine the course of the ball or the sequence of events: if he did believe he could, he would believe in magic. What he does do is to note for future guidance, that, if only he had struck the ball in a slightly different manner, he would have succeeded instead of failing in his purpose. Thus he learns by experience to do what he wants. And that is, in brief, how advance in medicine and science is effected. The magician however, or the believer in magic, believes that when the ball has been set rolling, or a sequence of events has been started, he can, by the influence of his will, or his mysterious power—and by means simply of it—interfere with the course of events: without drugs or the aid of medical art he can, by his will alone, influence, for good or for bad, the course of the patient's disease. That notion, however, has been banished from science: it is a notion as inconceivable as it would be to suppose that by taking thought you could add an inch to your stature, or that by simply willing it you could make a balance incline this way or that. What is in a man's power is to act or abstain from acting—to throw a stone or abstain from throwing it. But when once the stone has left the thrower's hand, its course cannot be affected by his will; nor has he any mysterious power, magical or miraculous, to suspend the law of gravitation, or modify the laws of motion. Our knowledge of the laws of nature is of service to us only so far as we act upon it: it is by obeying them, in the sense of acting upon them, that we get what we want, and not by using magic to over-ride them or to dispense with them. The difference between the good billiard player and the bad is that the former knows what shots are possible and tries them, whereas the latter in his ignorance tries shots that are either absolutely impossible, or impossible the way he attempts them. The magician, in his ignorance—and ignorance of the laws of nature is one of the parents of magic—tries to effect the impossible, and imagines it can be effected by the power of his will.

Science ascertains the limitations and conditions under which man's will can act: magic is based upon the assumption, born of ignorance, that there are no limits to the power of man's will.

Science, then, teaches what magic ignores, viz., the limits within which the power of man's will is circumscribed. Religion teaches what magic equally ignores, and ignores with more fatal results, viz., the limits within which man's will-power should be exercised. Its teaching is not directed, like that of science, to what man can do, and to distinguishing the possible from the impossible, but to determining what it is that man ought to will. He ought to will what is God's will; and the "fundamental distinction and opposition of principle" between magic and religion precisely is that by magic man means to do his own will: "Thy will be done" is an aspiration with which magic is incompatible. Where religion has not yet succeeded in throwing off magic, and still retains magical formulae and rites, it is partly because the incompatibility has not yet been realised, and partly because religion is still conceived to be, like magic, a means for ensuring that man's will is done. Thus when rain is wanted, it can be made, not indeed by magical power, but by the power of the man of God; or, if it is no longer so made, it is on record that it was once so made in the past. Here it is that the lingering belief in magic works with such evil effect on religion, pure and undefiled: rain or anything else man wants, be it what it may, can, it is supposed, be brought about by supernatural means; but, whether the means be magical or miraculous, in either case the object sought is that man's will be done, whereas the truly religious frame of mind is expressed in the words, "Not my will but Thine be done." We need not commit ourselves to denying the possibility of miracles on *a priori* grounds, for there are no such *a priori* grounds. But we may confidently hold that God's will is done in ways more miraculous than miracles, or any form of magic.

THE CHURCH: ECCLESIASTICAL AND VITAL.*

By the Rev. C. R. Shaw-Stewart, M.A.

The word "Church" conveys such a variety of meanings, and its use without qualification spreads so much confusion, that it has become essential for all thoughtful Church-people to get quite clear in their minds what they really believe to be the object and the purpose of the Church of Christ, the Church of the living God. What is its distinctive place and mission in human society? What distinguishes it from Jewish and non-Christian conceptions of a Church? The main purpose of clear thinking is to learn distinction in the use of terms.

It is clearly needful to recognise two main stages of development that have always been marked within the Church. St. Paul speaks of "babes" and "adults" both "in Christ." The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews urges the need of leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, so as to be borne along to full-growth. A useful modern equivalent has been given us lately in the phrase, "the lesser and the greater orthodoxy." We must therefore allow for the co-existence of immature and mature standards of judgment within the Church. Causes of quarrel need never arise from the side of the adults. A child necessarily thinks, feels, and speaks as a child. What you do is to encourage the growing manhood within him to be putting away, as he grows, childish things. What happens in the Church-family is that some refuse to grow up, and try to give completeness and finality to immature views and judgments. They fail to understand that it is only those who see who are qualified to lead the blind. "Let them be," said Jesus: the inevitable ditch, and not your protest, will prove to be the best corrective. It is easier, we all know, to be wilful than to examine our own state. Yet, as Plato has said, "The unexamined life is unliveable for a human being, for a real man."

(1) Let us look, then, at the standing of those who are in the immature, the ecclesiastical stage. It is the first natural stage

* Condensed report of an address to the West London Branch of the Churchmen's Union.

for all of us. It reflects our first outlook on the world. Thing look distinct and separate, complete in themselves. The world whether of external nature, or of thought, seems to owe it orderliness to superb mechanical contrivance, made intelligib to us by some intricate "chain of reasoning." So with th relations between God and man. Each seems to be a bein complete within himself, in a sense independent of the othe and yet needful to one another. Man, conscious of his nee of God, put forth his best efforts to establish some satisfacto relationship with Him. Hence arise cults, ceremonie doctrines, in infinite variety. Such methods of approach t God after a time are recognised to be unsatisfactory, becaus ineffective. The object sought is not attained. God remain unknown in a living, personal sense. The deep need of th heart remains unsatisfied. Inward unrest ensues. We are i fact growing out of the range of our early conceptions. Th same experience is being felt in all regions of human activit in ethics, in art, in philosophy, and so forth. What make us grow? It is Life.

(2) Life, then, becomes the basis and centre of the secon the mature region of consciousness. It provides an altogeth new outlook, hope, and way of attainment. It bids us repen in the true sense of the word; that is, to turn right away fro the old manner of thinking and acting, to look towards an into the face of God, and to see what *He* is doing with us an for us. Life is the original gift; it is touch with God, Whom everyone is a direct and unique expression. God an man, we see, never have been, and never can be, separabl The face of God shines forth in the exalted Christ, Who is th common life of all, unfolded in its glory and meaning an fulfilled purpose. He is the truth of our Being, presented us in intelligible form. He quickens in us the sense that w are possessed of the same life of which He is the fulness. H lifts us into the consciousness of infinite power of response all the richness of the gifts that life holds in store. This

while of admitted interest to liturgical experts, have but little value from the lay point of view. But inasmuch as it is the great body of the laity (the *sancta plebs Dei*) who are mainly concerned in this matter of the Public Worship of God, we beg that due regard may be paid to their opinion, and that a speedy attempt be made to solve their difficulties.

We would urge that, in considering the question, the study of its various aspects should not be confined to such authorities as the Reports of the Convocations, the revised liturgies put forth by Anglican churches in communion with the Church of England, the published liturgical efforts of private individuals, the reports and impressions of chaplains at the front, but that in addition considerable attention should be paid to the views expressed by laymen through correspondence and articles in the press. Newspaper correspondence is worthy of serious study by those who wish to understand the lay mind. Such a correspondence, amounting to at least nine thousand letters, as the "Do we Believe? Correspondence"[1] which took place in the *Daily Telegraph* in 1904, or the "Kikuyu Controversy" in the *Times* of more recent date, and many other less well-known newspaper correspondences on the attractive theme: "Why men do not go to Church," are far more indicative of national feeling than debates in the Houses of Laymen or in any ecclesiastical assembly, and therefore deserve the particular attention of the Archbishops' Committee. The attitude of many thoughtful religious laymen in this matter is reflected in a recent article in the *Cornhill*[2] by the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge wherein he expresses the hope that the Archbishops' Committee:—

> "will go further and consult the opinions and desires of the laity at large. After all, they are the people chiefly to be considered. Public worship is a public question, therefore the sphere of inquiry should not be confined to reports of Convocation and clerical evidence alone."

CAUSES OF DISSATISFACTION.

The causes of the existing dissatisfaction are of two kinds.

(1) Dissatisfaction with our services as authorised.

(2) Dissatisfaction with our services as rendered and solemnised by the clergy.

(I.) Dissatisfaction with our Services as authorised.

It is alleged that our authorised services contain features which render them dull, tedious and unreal. Hence they fail to make any strong appeal to the religious and moral consciousness of the great majority of educated and

[1] From which a selection was made by Mr. W. L. Courtney, and published by Hodder and Stoughton (1905).

[2] The *Cornhill Magazine* of June, 1917, p. 667.

uneducated Englishmen. It is even alleged in certain cases that they actually offend that moral and religious consciousness.

There are a number of reasons for these charges, and we think that the following remedies would allay the dissatisfaction in many cases.

REMEDIES.

(1) The abbreviation of the Services by the elimination of repetition.

Our Services at present contain a number of repetitions due in certain cases to the combination of Services. Without affirming that all repetitions are vain, we urge that to-day they are highly undesirable and should be abolished.

We suggest therefore that at no Service or combination of Services should the Lord's Prayer be used more than once, or the Royal Family, Clergy, or any other body be prayed for more than once; that the Collect be not repeated or more than one creed recited; that the *Gloria*[1] be used but once at the conclusion of the Psalms, and that it be altogether omitted at the conclusion of the Canticles.

Furthermore, we would suggest that, when existing Services are combined, as for instance Morning Prayer and Holy Communion, the clergyman should proceed direct from the *Benedictus* or *Jubilate* (or Third Canticle) to the Collect for Purity; also that, when the Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer are combined with the Litany, the Litany should conclude with the Lesser Litany, and the Lesser Litany, Lord's Prayer and Versicles immediately preceding the Collect of the Day in the Morning and Evening Services should be omitted.

(2) Abbreviation by the authorisation of brief alternative forms.

We also suggest that shorter and alternative forms of Exhortation, Confession and Absolution be supplied for Morning and Evening Prayer.

That permission be given to conclude the Invitatory Psalm (*Venite*) at the words "the sheep of His hand."

That some brief or common formula be authorised in administering the Elements at Holy Communion when more than twelve persons communicate.

That in the Communion Office the Decalogue be used in its ancient and shortened form, and that it be permissible to substitute for it Christ's summary of the Law and the Prophets.

That the average length of the Sunday Old Testament Lessons be reduced, and that fewer Psalms be assigned for recitation at the Sunday Services.

[1] We believe that the second half of the *Gloria* is popularly regarded not as an act of praise to the Deity, but as a declaration of the inflexible conservatism of the Church of England.

That the occasional offices of Baptism and Marriage be shortened, and also the Lesson at the Burial Service.

(3) Elimination of the less edifying portions and consequent concentration on the more edifying portions of the Services.

It is generally agreed that the appeal to the moral and religious consciousness would be assisted by a reform in the liturgical use of the Psalter and the Scriptures.

We therefore suggest that fewer Psalms be used, and these (as in the Introits in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.) be carefully selected for each Sunday and Holy Day. In this connection we would commend the latest revised use of the Psalter by the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

That portions be excised from Psalms in cases where the sense is obscure or the sentiment offensive to the Christian consciousness.

That an English instead of a Latin heading be given to each Psalm declaring concisely the occasion and purpose of the Psalm.

That the Lectionary include a Table of Second Lessons for Sundays, and that of the First Lessons a larger proportion be taken from the Prophets and the Canonical Wisdom literature, and also a small number from the Apocryphal Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch*, and *Maccabees;* and that a few alternative First Lessons be selected from the nobler Pseudepigrapha, such as the *Book of Enoch* and the *Psalms of Solomon.* This last class of lesson we conceive would be of particular value in illustrating the doctrinal and ethical development "between the Testaments." We think there is much to be said for a three years' course of such Sunday Lessons.

Also we would suggest that, in selecting portions of Scripture for Lessons, omissions should be freely made in the text of Scripture with the purpose of avoiding obscurity and prolixity; also that the Minister should be permitted to select alternative lessons with the consent of the Bishop.

Also we suggest that every Sunday and Holy Day lesson have a title prefixed, and a concise introduction setting forth the occasion and purpose of the Lesson, and that these be read out by the reader of the Lesson in Church.[1]

(4) The Elimination of Archaisms.

Another reason for dissatisfaction with our authorised services is commonly found in their archaisms. These archaisms are roughly of two kinds: (1) of phraseology; (2) of thought and feeling.

[1] This was proposed by Bishop Creighton, and the Rev. Sydney Cooper in a valuable article on the Lectionary in the *Modern Churchman* (December, 1913, pp. 475-482) suggests that the headings from Frazer's *Passages in the Bible* might serve as models.

(1) *Archaisms of Phraseology.*

An air of antiquity imparts dignity, and therefore we do not suggest any general modernisation of the diction of our services, but simply the translation or omission of phrases which are no longer understood in their original sense, *e.g.*, "miserable sinners," "indifferently administer justice," "children of wrath," "oblation," "let," "wealth," "regenerated," "vulgar," "lively," "general," "ghostly," &c. The same practice should, of course, be followed in the case of Psalms and portions of Scripture selected for liturgical use.

(2) *Archaisms of thought and feeling.*

But far more objectionable are the archaisms of thought and feeling in our services. Theological and ecclesiastical students can view these with the understanding, sympathy, and reverence, which belong to the possession of the historical sense, but this is impossible for the great majority of Church people.

It is probably impossible, and perhaps undesirable, to attempt to modify our Prayer Book services so as to make them reflect only the Christian thought and feeling of this age, but on the other hand we would urge that all reasonable care be used to remove from the services whatever conflicts acutely with it. The saying *lex orandi lex credendi* is profoundly true, and nothing is more prejudicial to the sense of reality in Christian worship than to provide forms of devotion containing statements which the would-be worshippers do not understand, or (if they understand them) do not believe. We are all well aware that Christian views as to the infallibility of Scripture, the method of Creation, the mode of the Atonement, the Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Advent, the character of Heaven and Hell, have all undergone serious change of late years, and we desire to see this recognised in our revised Prayer Book by the elimination or transmutation of phrases which are calculated to repel the modern-minded worshipper.

Where these archaisms occur in the Psalter and Old Testament the proposals we have already made will lead to their elimination. There are, however, others of pressing importance; perhaps the most serious of these being the use of the *Quicunque Vult*. Therefore we would urge, with the late Bishop Dowden (of Edinburgh) and many other members of the episcopate, that at our Public Worship its recitation be discontinued. It is true the Nicene Creed also contains certain technical and archaic phrases, but this formula is of such supreme historic interest and importance that we desire to see its retention at the Service of Holy Communion as at present.

In the case of the Apostles' Creed, which was the ancient Baptismal Symbol of the Roman Church, we confess that, inasmuch as the public recitation of Baptismal Creeds was unknown for many centuries in the Church except at Catechisings and Baptismal Services, we should prefer to

ee the Apostles' Creed relegated to its proper and original use in connection ith Baptism and Confirmation, and some simple modern declaration of hristian Faith and Duty substituted for recitation, as at least an optional lternative, at our ordinary Sunday Services.[1]

The Church is constantly charged with teaching an exploded doctrine f Original Sin in the Service of Infant Baptism. This ought to be remedied. Vithout admitting the justice of the charge, we would only urge that, if it e needful to insist on the doctrine of Original Sin at this service, it should e presented there in its modern form as indicating the presence of a re-disposition to yield to temptation due to the pressure of inherited animal mpulses, the subjugation of which is assisted by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

In our Communion Service the substitutionary view of the Atonement ppears in the use of the term "satisfaction." As this view is no longer enerally held by English Churchmen, we would urge that the word satisfaction" (as well as the word "oblation" as not understood) be omitted rom the Prayer of Consecration, and that the passage run: "Who made here a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world."

For a similar reason, we should prefer to see an English equivalent of *er Christum* substituted for the present English equivalents of *propter Christum* at the conclusion of a number of our prayers.[2] We believe there would even be no objection to omitting the formula *per Christum* in a certain number of cases altogether, inasmuch as the modern conception of prayer in the Name of Christ does not necessitate, as many supposed in the Middle Ages, the use of this formula.

As the Proper Preface for Whitsun Day teaches that the gift of tongues included the power to speak foreign languages, we desire to see it altered as being without historical support.

In this connection, we may perhaps point out that the Proper Prefaces in the Communion Office are generally of a very archaic character and of no particular literary merit.

In addressing the Divine Being we should prefer, following our Saviour's example, to see the Paternal rather than the Regal form of address prevail, and more emphasis laid on His moral attributes and less on His omnipotence.

---

[1] We believe that the Headmasters of our great public schools have produced such a form. The suggestion that the *Te Deum* be regarded as a Confession of Faith, and that it be used at Morning or Evening Prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed, has much to commend it.

[2] *Propter Christum* is unscriptural and a late liturgical usage. It is of interest to note that the original *per Christum* of the Collects for 2nd Sunday in Advent, Whitsun Day, 12th, 13th, and 24th after Trinity, has been altered to *propter Christum* in our Prayer Book. The other prayers in which it occurs are post-Reformation (1549-1662), Quinquagesima, Easter Eve, 1st Sunday after Easter, St. Luke's Day, General Confession in Communion Office, "All Sorts and Conditions."

See *Modern Churchman*, Vol. vi., No. 1, pp. 37-38; and also Vol. v., No. 12, p. 631.

(5) **The Elimination of exaggerated phraseology.**

Another cause of offence in our Services is the presence in them of certain phrases which pass beyond the general sobriety and restraint which characterise our Liturgy and so seem to offend against perfect sincerity. In this connection we would urge the omission of such a phrase as "and there is no health in us," from the General Confession, and the phrases "and wickedness," "Provoking most justly Thy wrath and indignation against us," "The burden of them is intolerable," in the Confession in the Communion Office. Also "miserable sinners" (mainly because it is misunderstood) from the Litany.

(6) **Additional Prayers and Services.**

(*a*) It is felt that our Services would gain in reality, interest and value if the range of petition were enlarged by the inclusion of national, parochial, local and domestic matters.

We would suggest, therefore, that prayers be provided asking for Divine Guidance and Blessing for the British Empire and Nation, for the local Government bodies, the parish and parochial officers and institutions, for our schools, colleges, and those who teach and learn in them, for the various professions, arts and sciences, for our political, social, industrial and commercial organizations, for our homes, etc. There are in existence some excellent Tudor models of the type of prayer desired.

In this connection we would suggest that permission be given to use extemporaneous prayer, either immediately before or immediately after the sermon at the Sunday Morning Service, and more freely at the evening and week-day services.

(*b*) That an alternative Evening Service be provided which shall differ considerably from the Morning Service, especially in the direction of being shorter and simpler, and admitting of extemporaneous prayer, prayer by bidding, and prayer in silence.

(*c*) That a number of additional opening sentences be provided suitable for the various Church Seasons, and also a number of additional Canticles. It is suggested that some of the latter might be selected from great Christian classics, *e.g.*, the writings of Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, Thomas à Kempis, Synesius of Cyrene, etc., and that liturgical use might be made of the Beatitudes and 1 Cor. xiii.

(*d*) That a number of schemes of Services be provided for National Thanksgivings and Intercessions, for Home and Foreign Missions, for Harvest Festivals, for Commemorations, Instructions, Dedications, and Family Worship.

(*e*) That a service be provided for the Reception by the bishop or his representative of an Adult Christian into the membership of the Church of

England from another Christian communion. Our Confirmation Office which is used at present for this purpose is obviously only suitable for young people who have been baptized according to the use of the Church of England.

(*f*) That the Service for the Churching of Women be re-cast, and that it be a thanksgiving for the child as well as for the mother.

(*g*) That a Service for the making of Deaconesses be provided.

(7) **Miscellaneous Suggestions.**

(1) That our Occasional Offices which are in grievous need of revision be abbreviated and modernised. We have ventured to append to this Memorandum three of the more important Occasional Offices revised in accordance with what we believe to be our present needs, and also an Order for the Burial of a Child.[1]

(2) That our Ordinal be revised:—

(*a*) by substituting in the Preface for "learned in the Latin tongue" the words "to be of good education."

(*b*) by amending the second question to Deacons so as to secure from them an affirmation that they believe that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (as in Article vi).

We venture to suggest that Ordinations be held much more frequently in Parish Churches and not simply at the Ember seasons, so that many of the laity who have never been present at an Ordination Service may be given the opportunity of attending.

(II.) **Dissatisfaction with our Services as rendered and solemnised by the clergy.**

The rendering of the Services often causes more dissatisfaction than defects in the services themselves. Complaints are made of mumbling, whispering, gabbling, "intoning" and "the clerical voice." It is plain that the laity like clear, manly tones, and prefer that the services should be said slowly and solemnly; and it would seem to us that the Prayer Book directions: "read with a loud voice," "distinctly, with an audible voice," "shall rehearse distinctly," support the demand of the laity.

Another series of complaints has reference to ritual innovations, *e.g.*, such a practice as "the ablutions" at the altar is deeply resented by many devout communicants. We have no desire to enter into ritual and vestiarian controversies here; as Liberals we favour judicious variation, but urge that the wishes of the parishioners should be sympathetically considered. While on the one hand the English layman dislikes slovenliness, irreverence and

[1] These four services may be found in the *Modern Churchman*, vol. vi., No. 5, p. 229, and vol. vii., No. 3, p. 124.

disorder, yet on the other hand he is a lover of simplicity and naturalness and is opposed to what appears to him to be the artificial and complicated.

Preaching is severely criticised, not usually on the grounds of excess or quantity, but of poorness of quality. The laity would plainly prefer a wider range of pulpit subject and greater freedom and naturalness of treatment.

Complaints are also made as to the difficult or elaborate character of Church music, seldom of its inferior quality. There is often here a conflict between the wishes of choir and congregation. Congregational instructions and practices would assist unity of ideal.

The main causes of the dissatisfaction voiced by these complaints would appear to be threefold.

(1) The imperfect training of Ordinands and young clergymen, both as officiants and also as teachers and preachers.

(2) A conflict of liturgical ideals within the Church of England, accompanied in some cases by a spirit of revolt against the authority of the Church and disloyalty to her principles.

(3) The almost entire exclusion of the laity from any legal right to be consulted as regards the type of services provided in their parish churches.

For proposed remedies to the first cause of dissatisfaction we beg to refer to the Memorandum on the Training of Ordinands adopted by the Council of the Churchmen's Union on May 15th, 1917.[1]

As regards the second cause of dissatisfaction, we believe that a more modern and thorough training for our Ordinands would meet some of the difficulties, but not all. We think that this conflict of liturgical ideals should be frankly recognised, and while we should deprecate on grounds of policy an alteration in the Ornaments Rubric, we should desire to see it interpreted in a very liberal manner, providing that no liturgical innovations be introduced into any church or chapel without the consent of at least three-fourths of the representatives of the parishioners. We strongly urge that the ideal of loyalty to liturgical uniformity be abandoned for the ideal of loyalty to English Church principles, and that mutual edification be aimed at rather than the introduction and multiplication of Catholic customs on the one hand or the maintenance of Protestant purity on the other.

The remedy for the third cause of dissatisfaction we do not propose to deal with here, as we anticipate an adequate treatment of it in the Memorandum to be presented to the Council on the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State. We will only say that we look to the giving of legal powers to the parochial laity to assist in removing the present unsatisfactory situation.

[1] Published by John Murray. Price 6d.

We urge strongly that the hours of the Sunday services, especially of Morning Prayer and Holy Communion, should be subject to the control of the representatives of the parishioners. These hours have, in many parishes, been altered of late years by the clergy, and have seriously diminished the attendance of the laity.

We suggest also that larger use be made of the services of trained and accomplished laymen and laywomen in assisting in the conduct of Public Worship.

CONCLUSION.

We do not claim that the suggestions made here are novel. We are glad to know that many of them have been made on various occasions by others. Some of them have been adopted by Churches in communion with the Church of England, and a number of them have received the support of members of our Convocations.

We only wish to re-assert the needs which the growing dissatisfaction with our Public Worship evinces, and what we believe to be the main remedies for that dissatisfaction.

We yield to none in our admiration of our incomparable Liturgy. The beauty, harmony, and richness of its diction are only too apparent when compared with modern liturgical compositions. We would not willingly suggest its alteration except there were dire need to do so. Yet while suggesting alterations we do not wish to see any grave departure from the principles and ideals of the compilers of that Liturgy.

Those ideals differ clearly from Roman ideals on the one hand and from Puritan ideals on the other, and it will be the wisdom of our Church authorities to-day to reform our Public Worship on Anglican and not on Papal or Puritan lines. This is not the place to deal with Anglican liturgical ideals, they are well-known to all liturgiologists; we refer to them only to emphasize that we do not desire any serious departure from them. Anglican liturgical ideals still appeal, we believe, to the English temperament, and we wish to see those ideals retained and applied in a revised Liturgy. We desire some happy combination of continuity and modernity. We desire not less art but less archaeology in our Services. Each service we feel should be "a well-balanced unity," full of life and movement, skilfully appealing to the moral and spiritual nature of the worshippers, and concentrating their attention for a brief period upon that unseen but ever-present God Whose Name is to be adored and Whose Will accomplished, not only during the hours of Public Worship but in all the occupations and experiences of our daily life.

Wm. B. Gordon.
Dora Nussey.
Henry D. A. Major.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE SPIRIT.*

By the Right Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D., Lord Bishop of Southwark.

"One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all."—*Eph.* iv. 4.

(1) It is a common-place of commentary and exposition to emphasize the distinction between St. Paul's doctrine of unity in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the ideal spiritual commonwealth presented in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he is dealing with a practical question calling urgently for solution and for firm handling; and the problem of corporate unity and responsibility is treated from the man's point of view, of what will work, of the human motives which are to have full play to make unity and corporate responsibility work.

Perhaps St. Paul discovered through his characteristic alertness to the lessons of time and experience, perhaps all the while he felt that it is not only not enough, but even may be positively misleading, to work for unity in the first instance or only along that line. Diversities of gifts, of outlook, of service, may all be made to contribute to the life and work of a corporate body, all transfigured and vivified by the motive of Love. But the question still remains what will give that motive its reality? What will save it from becoming a mere sentiment or a catchword? What makes it inevitable? And the Epistle to the Ephesians lifts the whole question of unity on to another level: there we are bidden to look at unity not from man's point of view, but from God's: to try to see the Church as it is in the mind of God.

But more than that. The point of vital importance to keep in view is that unless and until the Church is so seen first, all our attempts to create or formulate or define Christian unity will be stultified.

---

* A Sermon preached at the Corporate Celebration of the Holy Communion, June 21st, 1917, in S. Sepulchre's, Holborn.

It would have been well if throughout all those well-intentioned pathetic attempts at reconciliation, what we now call reunion, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the distinction and the lesson had been accepted as a commonplace, and had been the basis upon which all the attempts had been made. Pathetic indeed, because somehow such attempts have always ended in emphasizing and exaggerating differences. And if you ask me how comes this to be? I would answer because men have limited themselves to man's conception of an organization; we begin by attempting to define "essentials" or "fundamentals:" upon the basis of an agreed definition we create some structure, some constitution which shall realize its corporate character and do its work: and again very naturally as human beings we are attracted by the idea of an agreement which can be seen on the face of it, an agreed organization, constitution, ceremonial, mode of worship. And all this we may admit to the full is the way in which human beings are led and made to work together, and to realize their corporate life and power in the world as we know it.

True, but let no one suppose that there we have Christian unity as God sees it—or that along that level we shall ever attain it.

That unity as God sees it in its essence is unlike any other unity, not only in degree but in kind. It is a unity which acknowledges the permanent claim upon each and all of Christ, His mind, His standard, His command. The recognition of such a claim involves the same great venture of the human spirit on the part of each and all. It is the venture described by our poet:

"So in man's self arise
August anticipations, symbols, types
Of a deep splendour ever on before
In that eternal circle life pursues.
For men begin to pass their nature's bound
And find new hopes and fears which fast supplant
Their proper joys and griefs: they grow too great
For narrow creeds of right and wrong, which fade
Before the unmeasured thirst for good: while peace
Rises within them ever more and more."

Peace: that is the unity and harmony of life.

That great venture in this high endeavour, this deep inward trust, springs from the fact of Baptism into the Name, the fact of profounder and far more supreme significance about any human creature than anything you can say about him, the fact of being received and recognised as a living spiritual member of a spiritual society, the fact which does declare to each and to all the Fatherhood of God; that from Him we come, to Him we go. St. Paul sums all up in the phrase: One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all.

If you are prepared to admit the truth underlying what I have tried to put before you in mere outline, then I am moved to urge you to consider two points, which appear to me in my circumstances, and with my own responsibilities of practical importance.

I am overseer of a Diocese containing two-and-a-half millions of our fellow-countrymen; here, in "our dear, dear England," in these most critical years, critical in a very real sense because circumstances have arisen and issues have been raised which make it impossible to evade the question or to leave it open till the time is ripe. "Upon what terms are these millions of fellow-countrymen to live together? What motive, what outlook on life compels men and women to make the best not only of *one* self, but of all other selves?" In the face of such a crisis all who profess and call themselves Christian are called upon to unite in declaring that never in the world can there be the true sense of responsibility, the real regard for man as man, the invincible belief in his infinite possibilities, except as the expression of the Christian belief in the Fatherhood of God, and the fact of man's sonship proclaimed and realized by Baptism into the Name. But they will not unite in claiming and making good the Christian solution of the problem, how we are all to live and work together, unless they are united in the conviction that there is a real spiritual fellowship as God sees it, which goes beyond and lies deeper than the visible forms and precise

definitions which differentiate only for the purpose of division of labour in God's cause in this His world.

Nature in spring-time to me reveals the parable of such fellowship, of its reality and power: there I notice the uniqueness, the differences, the distinctions of tree, and bush, and plant, of foliage and flower, of growth and form. All burst into life, each shaping and fulfilling itself in its own course, yet all united in one great law of natural life, the same power of growth and life throbbing and pulsing through them all: they agree to differ, but the emphasis is on agreement, and the agreement is fundamental.

Such is the abiding unity, the fellowship, the real brotherhood of all who are declared by Baptism into the Name to be spiritual members of redeemed humanity and recognise themselves and one another as living, co-operating, growing in God's great purpose of redemption.

Starting with the conviction of that fellowship we can work together naturally, without self-consciousness or strained sincerity, to remove the wrongs which disfigure and degrade our human intercourse, for uplifting one another to the true level of sons who own and are loyal to the Fatherhood of God.

Starting with the conviction of that fellowship, we interpret the great saying "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me," not as an inflexible formula of exclusiveness, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, but as the revelation of God's mighty working in many modes through many agencies, and recognise in all who manifestly have come near to God the power of Christ to bring them there.

Starting with that conviction I shall not shrink, as otherwise I should shrink, from emphasizing not less strongly my second plea.

If, and only if, we begin by realizing primal fellowship in God's sight declared by Baptism—then I can plead for closest attachment, earnest loyalty, the deep sense of primary obligation to the corporate life of this our own Church in

our England, with her peculiar identity, her special opportunity, her unique responsibility. Of us, her members, it is required by the very terms of our existence as a Church, unlike any other religious body in the country, that the work of Christ shall be done, that the Ministry of Word and Sacraments shall be offered as effectively as self-denial and self-sacrifice can offer them effectively in every parish throughout our land, whatever the circumstances or conditions. That in practice is the real meaning and motive of our inclusiveness and comprehensiveness. As soon as ever we have forgotten that meaning, or become indifferent to that motive, and deliberately take what is in fact the easier and more palpable line of rigid definition and limitation, of yielding to impatience, to the desire for certitude, to the narrow outlook of the possibilities of our own Church, we shall most certainly withdraw from the responsibility of being the Church of Christ witnessing in every parish to His Ministry of Word and Sacrament through all the chances and changes of our history.

It is equally certain that, if that responsibility is to be effectively discharged and loyally welcomed, we shall safeguard ourselves against the perils of mere criticism and analysis, mere intellectualism, of dissipating spiritual truths in mere abstractions, which become more and more ineffective for the purpose of the work set us as a Church to do in these times and under these circumstances. That, too, becomes with fatal facility the line of least resistance; it is fatally easy for the broad-minded, the liberal, and the all-inclusive, to draw the line of obligation of faith and practice just where it suits individual comfort and caprice.

> "If ye know these great truths happy are ye if ye do them."
> "If a man wills to do His will, he shall come to know the doctrine."

Study, research, analysis, synthesis, historical criticism, speculation, by all means bring all that modern thought and revelation have to contribute to the life of the Church; but remember that true to our ordination vow we do so according

to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the due order of this realm, that is as part of that organized system of Church life and Church work into which we were born in our time, under which we are set to do our work, diocese, deanery, parish. There never can be for us members of the Church, whoever we are, whatever our instincts, mere academic discussion, mere flights of speculation; we are engaged in the ceaseless struggle against sin and misery and degration and ignorance; that struggle we claim as our own, not as individuals but as a Church; the help that we can give, each of us, or each section of us, becomes effective, just so far as we give it in co-operation. Any section of our Church in this country, in these times, must end in futility, if it stands like Ephraim, "a wild ass alone by itself."

My one word to you to-day, my brethren, is this: forgive me if I seem presumptuous, or, what is worse, guilty of a dreary platitude; it is the word which comes from the heart of a Bishop who believes, with all his soul and mind, in the possibilities and recognises the distinction of this our Church, the Church of the land of our fathers. Whatever be your interest, your line of thought, your prejudices, throw them heartily into the work and order of our Church life here and now. Set faith and spiritual truth and profession very high, only because the demands made upon you in practice will thereby become all the more exacting. Make the obligations of Church life, of our corporate responsibility, the first and central rule of life.

"Bear with those that Christ will bear with; especially learn the master duty of self-denial—for it is self that is the greatest enemy to Catholicism," to the unity of the spirit in the bond of Peace.

THE ANNUAL GATHERING OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

The Annual Gathering of the Churchmen's Union in London on June 21st was very well attended considering the difficulties and demands which the War imposes. It opened with the corporate celebration of the Holy Communion in the historic church of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn, at which a thoughtful and encouraging sermon was preached by the Bishop of Southwark on the theme of fellowship in the Christian Church.[1]

The Business Meeting at 3-30, in the Hall of Sion College, was presided over by Canon Glazebrook. The Annual Report having been adopted, and the statement of accounts passed, the new officers of the Council were duly elected.[2]

The accounts shewed some £150 in hand. The Hon. Sec., however, urged members not to regard this as an indication of the Union having more money than it knew what to do with, and therefore as a reason for reducing their subscriptions. This balance would enable the Union to proceed with security to carry out much propaganda work for which hitherto funds have been lacking.

The routine business completed, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—

> "That the Training of Candidates for Ordination urgently needs reforms of the kind indicated in the Council's Memorandum."

The Dean of Carlisle, who moved the resolution, confessed that the attitude of the old Broad Church party towards theological colleges and the whole question of theological training, had been a mistake. They had refused to have anything to do with the theological college system. The attitude of Broad Churchmen to-day was sympathetic. They recognised the usefulness of theological colleges, but they desired that the theological training given in them should be as thorough, systematic, and scientific as possible.

The Master of Marlborough, who seconded the resolution, emphasized the need of a training for ordinands which would terminate the widening separation between clergymen and laymen. We found ourselves with people whose mentality we could understand and with people whose mentality we could not understand, and there appeared to be an increasing number of clergymen who belonged to the latter class. The demand by the

[1] Published in this number of the *Modern Churchman*, p. 186.

[2] For their names see the inside of the front cover of the *Modern Churchman* of this issue.

lerical party for a narrow Church franchise, was an example of this inability o understand the lay mind. The widening of the franchise in the State endered impossible a narrowing up of the franchise in the National Church. The kind of education some of the clergy received, and its meagre amount, ndoubtedly accounted for some of the things of which the laity complain. He therefore favoured a reform in the system of the training of ordinands which would increase the confidence of the laity in the clergy.

A resolution, "That the services which women are able to render prove hat the Church would gain by giving them a higher status, with a orresponding measure of authority and initiative," was not carried, although loquently supported by Miss Picton Turbervill and the Rev. Cavendish Moxon. The failure to carry the resolution was not due to any lack of ympathy on the part of the Union with the movement to admit women to he diaconate and to the office of public teaching in the Church, but to some eeling of uncertainty as to the exact meaning and scope of the resolution.

The proposal to alter the name of the Society from Churchmen's Union o Modern Churchmen's Union, a resolution in favour of which, was carried ast year at the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Oxford, was introduced y the Rev. J. Frome Wilkinson. There was little time to debate the uestion, which was referred to the new Council.

At the Public Meeting at 5-30, our President (Professor Percy Gardner) felicitously welcomed the speakers—the Master of Balliol, whom e introduced as the worthy successor of Dr. Jowett and Dr. Edward Caird; Mr. Clutton Brock, so much of whose wisdom they had digested at the reakfast table that they were all extremely anxious to hear his speech on he present occasion; and the Rev. C. W. Emmet, well known to them all or his indefatigable work and interest in their society. The President dded that the Union welcomed freedom of speech, and accepted, with ecoming gratitude, the friendly smitings of the righteous.

The Master of Balliol, who was very cordially received, dealt with "The Failure of the Church."[1]

Mr. Clutton Brock spoke next on "Sin against the Holy Ghost." As vas to be expected, the speaker treated his theme in a fresh and original ashion. Sin against the Holy Ghost was not the sin of the ape nor of the iger in us, but the sin of the donkey. The most terrible of evils in the vorld, strange to say, were caused not by the tiger, but by the donkey. Even the present war was caused by the donkey, and not by the tiger. We ll believed before the war, and the Germans believed it most of all, that hey were a highly civilised people, yet they failed to see that their conduct vas fatal to civilisation or *Kultur*. Their blindness, the donkey in them,

[1] The full text of his address is given on p. 149 of this number of the *Modern Churchman*.

would prove their ruin. Not only had they as a nation embarked on a career of vice, but they had become lunatics in it.

The industrial system of this country, and the industrial war on which we are ever on the verge, was another example of the sin of the donkey. It had already been the cause of much misery, and would, if we continued to allow the donkey in us to blind our intelligence, plunge us into the most terrible catastrophe.

Men were constantly sinning against the Holy Ghost, or in other words sinning against the moral and rational order of the universe in the most deliberate fashion, and then when disaster ensued they tried to place the blame on the universe or on God.

But why did Christ speak of sin against the Holy Ghost as something which could not be forgiven? It was sin which those who committed would not realise was sin, and so they could not repent of it. The cure for it was deep humility and reverence for God's voice in our heart.

The Rev. C. W. EMMET spoke next on the work and aims of the Churchmen's Union. The Union was an organisation existing for a definite purpose, the defence and propagation of Liberal principles in the Church. Crises arise when Liberal principles or Liberal Churchmen are in danger; to create an organization on the spur of the moment for purposes of defence was impossible, but the Churchmen's Union was at hand ready to act. An example of this was furnished by the action of the Union in the crisis created by the Kikuyu controversy. On that occasion it was able to organise an influential petition to the Upper House of the Southern Convocation which had its effect upon the final decision of that body.

But we were not content to remain as a reserve force in the background. Foremost among our normal activities was the publication of the *Modern Churchman*. We hoped in the near future to extend that side of our work very considerably by the issue of Manuals. Then there was the work done by Committees of the Council, *e.g.*, the committee in connection with the work of the National Mission, or the work of the recent committee on the training of candidates for Holy Orders, which would not be without its influence on the deliberations of the Archbishops' committee. Other committees were sitting at the present time, and we should see the results of their work in the near future.

Another form of activity was the Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen. The fourth was to be held this year at Cambridge. These conferences with their happy combination of reverent worship, hard thinking, and social intercourse promised to attain very important dimensions after the war.

Then there was the work of local branches. Here there was an enormous amount to be done, in view of the growing body of liberal feeling throughout

ne country which needed encouragement, instruction, and organisation. There were great reservoirs of lay opinion, eager for knowledge, but inarticulate and afraid of itself; local branches would serve as a rallying point.

It was difficult to speak in a sentence of the general effect of the war on our religion, whether at home or at the front. But certainly the war had aroused in many a desire for a vital religion, a religion in touch with modern life and thought, and working for truth and righteousness. Many had come to despair of the Church, but we must show them that there is a real hope of new life for her, and that they can find a home within her walls where they will not always be fed with the stone of tradition instead of the bread of sincerity and truth. The urgent need for reconstruction would not leave the Church untouched. There was a movement for self-government in the Church, but the important thing was what she would do with it when she had got? Would she use her power to discourage the spirit of adventure in thought as well as in action, to stereotype and force upon all methods of worship and modes of thought out of harmony with much of the best in modern life? Would she narrow her borders and accentuate the lines of division between herself and the nation? It was incumbent upon Liberals to tap, without delay, that reservoir of silent and unorganised lay opinion, and to organise it and make it articulate. If they were going to have elections to public bodies with a real power to influence Church policy, Liberals would have to take the trouble to secure the expression of their views. The sparrow sitting alone upon the house top and twittering his liberal sentiment was not a very effective force in the face of High Church and Low Church organization. They appealed strongly to those within the Church who were in sympathy with Liberal opinion, and to that yet larger body who, without formally repudiating connection with the Church, had ceased to take any effective share or interest in her work, to unite with those who were working for the things they desired. We believe passionately in Christianity, we also believe passionately in the opportunity which lies before our own Church, and we refuse to despair of her. There was, he added, no need to apologise for the Churchmen's Union, or to be at all ashamed of their membership. The Union had done useful work in the past, but they were convinced that, in view of the urgent and pressing needs of the immediate future, it would, if properly supported, have a most valuable effect on the work and policy of the Church of England in the years to come.

The Meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

Canon Glazebrook (the Chairman of the Council) and the Rev. Cavendish Moxon (the Honorary Secretary) are to be congratulated on the excellence of the arrangements.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

London Branch.—A meeting of the West London branch was held on May 22nd, at 39, Harrington Gardens, on the kind invitation of Sir Laurence and Lady Jones. There was a good attendance. The Rev. C. R. Shaw Stewart spoke on "The Church, Ecclesiastical and Vital," and an interesting discussion followed, in which many took part. It was announced that Miss Hill, 59, Hyde Park Mansions, Marylebone Road, N.W. 1, had kindly consented to act as the Secretary and Treasurer to this branch. Members are requested to communicate with her on any business.

Oxford Branch.—A well attended meeting was held at Lincoln College on June 7th, by kind invitation of Professor and Mrs. Gardner. A paper was read by the Rev. C. W. Emmet on *Suggested Reforms in the use of the Psalms*. Examining the schemes before Convocation, and the alternative methods in use in different parts of the Anglican Communion, he pointed out that they were all compromises, though any of them would be an improvement on our present method. What we needed was a Revised Psalter for use in Public Worship. Revisions would include (*a*) the omission of certain Psalms, (*b*) the omission of verses or sections, (*c*) necessary re-translations. There were precedents in plenty, both ancient and modern, for all three. He laid special stress on the advisability of omitting verses, since in this way Psalms could be retained which we should be sorry to lose altogether. With such a Revised Psalter the objections to our monthly rotation would disappear, so long as there was reasonable facility for choosing appropriate Psalms for special occasions. But it would probably be advisable to have a table of Proper Psalms for all Sundays from Advent to Trinity. A further suggestion was that the morning and evening Psalms, both special and ordinary, should be transposed in alternate years, since at present a large number of our people were familiar with one or the other group only.

An excellent discussion followed, the speakers being Canon Sanday, Dr. Skrine, Mrs. Matheson, Miss Dougall, and Messrs. Webb, Garratt, Powell, Parr, and Barron. In spite of some criticisms on points of detail, there was a general agreement with the main principles suggested, and it was widely felt that a radical change in the present use was urgently called for. Canon Sanday suggested that the Revised Psalter might at first be printed as an Appendix for alternative use.

*** We regret that very great pressure on our space compels the holding over of all Correspondence and Reviews.—Ed. *M.C.*